arXiv:0804.1424v1 [math.NT] 9 Apr 2008

EXPANDING TRANSLATES OF CURVES AND DIRICHLET-MINKOWSKI THEOREM ON LINEAR FORMS

NIMISH A. SHAH

Abstract. We show that a multiplicative form of Dirichlet's theorem on simultaneous Diophantine approximation as formulated by Minkowski, cannot be improved for almost all points on any analytic curve on $\mathbb{R}^k$ which is not contained in a proper affine subspace. Such an investigation was initiated by Davenport and Schmidt in the late sixties.

The Diophantine problem is then settled via showing that certain sequence of expanding translates of curves on the homogeneous space of unimodular lattices in $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ gets equidistributed in the limit. We use Ratner's theorem on unipotent flows, linearization techniques, and a new observation about intertwined linear dynamics of various $\mathrm{SL}(m,\mathbb{R})$'s contained in $\mathrm{SL}(k+1,\mathbb{R})$.

1. Introduction

Extending Dirichlet's theorem (1842) on simultaneous Diophantine approximation in various forms, Minkowski (1896) proved the following theorem as a consequence of his convex body theorem [15, Chap.-II]:

Minkowski's theorem on linear forms. . *Let* $(\varphi_{ij}) \in \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n$ *be positive numbers with* $\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n = 1$. *Then there exist integers* $x_1,\dots,x_n$, *not all zero, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &|\varphi_{11}x_1+\cdots+\varphi_{1n}x_n| \le \alpha_1 \\ &|\varphi_{i1}x_1+\cdots+\varphi_{in}x_{in}| < \alpha_i \quad (2\le i\le n). \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

By putting $\varphi_{11}=\cdots=\varphi_{nn}=1$, and $\varphi_{ij}=0$ for $i\ne j$ and $i\ge 2$, we obtain a multiplicative variation of Dirichlet's theorem: *Given* $(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k)\in\mathbb{R}^k$ *and positive integers* $N_1,\dots,N_k$, *there exist integers* $q_1,\dots,q_k$ *and* p, *not all zero, such that*

$$|q_1\xi_1+\cdots+q_k\xi_k-p| \le (N_1\cdots N_k)^{-1}, \quad |q_i|<N_i \quad (1\le i\le k). \tag{1.2}$$

Following Davenport and Schmidt [7], we say that given any infinite set $\mathcal{N}\subset(\mathbb{Z}_+)^k$, the Dirichlet's theorem (DT) cannot be improved along $\mathcal{N}$ for $(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k)\in\mathbb{R}^k$, if for every $0<\mu<1$ there are infinitely many $(N_1,\dots,N_k)\in\mathcal{N}$ such that the following system of inequalities is insoluble for integers $q_1,\dots,q_k$ and p, not all zero:

$$|q_1\xi_1+\cdots+q_k\xi_k-p| \le \mu(N_1\cdots N_k)^{-1}, \quad |q_i|<\mu N_i \quad (1\le j\le k). \tag{1.3}$$

Date: February 22, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E40, 11J83.

Davenport and Schmidt [7] showed that for $\mathscr{N} = \{(N, \dots, N) \in \mathbb{Z}^k : N \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, the DT cannot be improved along $\mathscr{N}$ for almost all points of $\mathbb{R}^k$. The same conclusion was obtained by Kleinbock and Weiss [11] for sets $\mathscr{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}^k$ with infinite projection on each coordinate.

In fact, Davenport and Schmidt [8] showed that for $k = 2$, and for almost every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, the inequalities (1.3) for $(\xi_1, \xi_2) = (\xi, \xi^2)$ do not have nonzero integral solution for infinitely many $N_1 = N_2$. Such results for related quantities, say for points on a certain type of curve or a submanifold, were subsequently generalized in [1, 9, 2, 11]; in each case for $\mu \leq \mu_0$ for some small explicit value of $\mu_0 < 1$ depending on the curve or the submanifold.

In the case of $\mathscr{N} \subset \{(N, \dots, N) \in \mathbb{Z}^k : N \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, in [19] it was shown that for any analytic curve which is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^k$, the DT cannot be improved along $\mathscr{N}$ for almost all points on the curve; that is, for all $\mu < 1$. In this article we will extend this result for any $\mathscr{N}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathscr{N}$ be an infinite subset of $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^k$. Then for any analytic curve $\varphi : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^k$ whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace, the DT cannot be improved along $\mathscr{N}$ for $\varphi(s)$ for Lebesgue almost every $s \in [a, b]$.*

This theorem can be reformulated in terms of dynamics of flows on the homogeneous space $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$; cf. [11, §2.1]. We need to prove that certain sequence of expanding translates a curve on this space tend to become uniformly distributed. To adept the strategy of [19] for the general $\mathscr{N}$, we will need to overcome significant technical difficulties, whose resolution will require making new observations and developing much sharper methods.

1.1. **Asymptotic equidistribution of translated curves.** Let $n \geq 2$ and $G = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. For $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, define

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{(\tau_1 + \cdots + \tau_{n-1})} & & & \\ & e^{-\tau_1} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & e^{-\tau_{n-1}} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad u(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \xi_1 & \dots & \xi_{n-1} \\ & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1.4}$$

Let $\mathscr{T} = \{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset R^{n-1}$ be a sequence such that if $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = (\tau_{i,1}, \dots, \tau_{i,n-1})$ then $\tau_{i,1} \geq \tau_{i,2} \geq \cdots \geq \tau_{i,n-1} \geq 0$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_i\| \xrightarrow{i \to \infty} \infty$. After passing to a subsequence we further assume that there exists $1 \leq m_1 \leq n-1$ such that $\tau_{i,m_1} \xrightarrow{i \to \infty} \infty$ and $\lim_{i \to \infty} \tau_{i,r} = \tau(r) < \infty$ for $m_1 < r \leq n-1$.

For $2 \leq m \leq n$, define

$$Q_m = \left\{ \left[\begin{smallmatrix} g & \boldsymbol{w} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & I_{n-m} \end{smallmatrix} \right] \in G : g \in \mathrm{SL}(m, \mathbb{R}),\ \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathrm{M}_{m \times (n-m)}(\mathbb{R}) \right\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{0}$ is the $(n-m) \times m$-zero matrix and I_{n-m} is the $(n-m) \times (n-m)$-identity matrix.

The main goal of this article is to prove the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ be an analytic map whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace. Let L be a Lie group and Λ a lattice in L. Let $\rho : G \to L$ be a continuous homomorphism. Let $x_0 \in L/\Lambda$ and H be a minimal closed* *subgroup of L containing $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$ such that the orbit Hx_0 is closed and admits a unique H-invariant probability measure, say μ_H. Then for any bounded continuous function f on L/Λ the following holds:*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1}{|b-a|} \int_a^b f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)))x_0)\, ds = \int_{Hx_0} f(\rho(a_{\tau_0})x_0)\, d\mu_H(x), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\tau}_0 = (0, \dots, 0, \tau(m_1+1), \dots, \tau(n-1))$.

Note that $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$ is generated by Ad-unipotent one-parameter subgroups of L. Hence by Ratner's theorem [14] Hx_0 is the closure of the $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$-orbit of x_0.

The above result in the case when $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = (\tau_i, \dots, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for a sequence $\tau_i \overset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty$ was proved in [19]. We will generalize that proof to obtain the above result. The main new contribution here is a strong general result about dynamics of intertwined linear actions of various $\mathrm{SL}(m,\mathbb{R})$'s contained in G. Along with new interesting observations, its proof crucially uses the 'Basic lemma' from [19] on joint linear dynamics of various $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$'s cotained in $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$.

For the basic application of the theorem we will put $L = G$, $\Lambda = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$, ρ the identity matrix, and $x_0 = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$. Then $H = Q_{m_1+1}$, because $Q_{m_1+1} \cap \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$ is a lattice in Q_{m_1+1}.

For more examples, let σ be an involutive automorphism of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$\sigma(g) := \mathfrak{w}({}^{\mathbf{t}}g^{-1})\mathfrak{w}^{-1}, \quad \forall g \in \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R}), \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ permutes the standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\mathfrak{w}(e_i) = e_{n+1-i}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n. \tag{1.8}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} &:= \sigma(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\tau n-1} & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & e^{\tau 1} & \\ & & & e^{-(\tau_1+\cdots+\tau_{n-1})} \end{bmatrix}, \\ u'(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &:= \sigma(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \xi_{n-1} \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & 1 & \xi_1 \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

$$Q'_m := \sigma(Q_m) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-m} & \boldsymbol{w} \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times(n-m)} & g \end{bmatrix} : g \in \mathrm{SL}(m,\mathbb{R}),\ \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathrm{M}_{(n-m)\times m}(\mathbb{R}) \right\}.$$

Another example of Theorem 1.2 is obtained as follows: Let $L = G \times G$ and define the homomorphism $\rho : G \to L$ by

$$\rho(g) := (g, \sigma(g)), \quad \forall g \in G. \tag{1.10}$$

Let $\Lambda = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$. Then $\rho(\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})) \subset \Lambda$. Then $\rho(Q_{m_1+1}) \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$. Put $x_0 = e\Lambda$. If we apply Theorem 1.2 in this case then for its conclusion $H = \rho(Q_{m_1+1})$.

1.2. **Some applications.** Using the conclusion of the theorem in the above example we obtain the following result on non-improvability of Dirichlet's theorem on simultaneous Diophantine approximation in the dual form.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* $k \geq 1$*, and* $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^k$ *be an analytic curve whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace. Let* $\mathcal{N}$ *be an infinite subset of* $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^k$*. Then for almost every* $s \in I$ *and any* $\mu < 1$*, there exists infinitely many* $(N_1, \ldots, N_k) \in \mathcal{N}$ *such that both the following sets of inequalities are simultaneously insoluble:*

$$|q_1\varphi(s) + \cdots + q_k\varphi(s) - p| \leq \mu(N_1 \ldots N_k)^{-1}, \quad |q_i| \leq N_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq k) \tag{1.11}$$

for $(p, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1} \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$*, and*

$$|q\varphi_i(s) - p_i| \leq N_i^{-1} \quad (1 \leq i \leq k), \qquad |q| \leq \mu N_1 \ldots N_k \tag{1.12}$$

for $(q, p_1, \ldots, p_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1} \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$*.*

Above statement is stronger than Theorem 1.1. It also generalizes [19, Theorem 1.4], which considered the case of $\mathcal{N}$ where $N_1 = N_2 = \cdots = N_k$.

Corollary 1.4. *Let* $\mathcal{N} \subset (\mathbb{Z}_+)^n$ *be an infinite set. Let* M *be a connected Riemannian analytic submanifold of* $\mathbb{R}^k$ *which is not contained in a proper affine subspace of* $\mathbb{R}^k$*. Then with respect to the measure class on* M *associated to the Riemannian volume form, for almost every* $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in M$*, the DT cannot be improved for* $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ *along* $\mathcal{N}$*.*

In fact, the conclusion of Theorem 1.3 holds for almost all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in M$ *in place of* $\varphi(s)$*.*

It is interesting in the above results that we can take $\mathcal{N}$ with bounded projections on some of the coordinates. In this case such results were not known earlier even for almost all points of $\mathbb{R}^k$. For Theorem 1.1, it is essential that the limits $N_{0,j}$ for $m_1 < j \leq n-1$ are integral:

Theorem 1.5. *Let* $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ *be an unbounded sequence such that one of the coordinate converges to a non-integral real value. Then there exist* $0 < \mu < 1$ *such that for all but finitely many* $(N_1, \ldots, N_k) \in \mathcal{N}$ *and every* $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^k$*, the system of inequalities* (1.3) *admit nonzero integral solutions.*

This fact, which is a consequence of Minkowski-Hajós Theorem, corroborates the counter examples given in [11, §4.4] and answers a question raised there.

1.3. **Non-improvability of Minkowski's theorem along certain $\mathcal{N}$.**

Theorem 1.6. *Let* $\varphi = (\varphi_{ij}) : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ *be an analytic map such that* $\mathbb{R}$-span$\{\varphi_{1,j}(s) : s \in I\} = \mathbb{R}^n$*. Let* $\mathscr{N}$ *be an infinite set of positive integers. Then for almost every* $s \in I$*, there exists an infinite subset* $\mathscr{N}_s \subset \mathscr{N}$ *such that for any* $\mu < 1$ *the following system of inequalities is insoluble for any* $\alpha \in \mathscr{N}_s$ *and* $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{0\}$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} &|\varphi_{1,1}x_1 + \cdots + \varphi_{1,n}x_n| \leq \mu\alpha^{-n} \\ &|\varphi_{i,1}x_1 + \cdots + \varphi_{i,n}x_{i,n}| \leq \mu\alpha, \quad (2 \leq i \leq n). \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be an infinite subset of $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^{n-1}$ with unbounded projection on every coordinate. Let φ be as in Theorem 1.6. We further assume that $\varphi_{i1}(s) \equiv 0$ and $\varphi_{ij}(s) \equiv \varphi_{ij}$ are constant functions for all $i \geq 2$. Then for almost every $s \in I$, there exists an infinite subset $\mathcal{N}_s \subset \mathcal{N}$ such that for every $\mu < 1$ the following system of inequalities is insoluble in for any $(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{N}_s$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{0\}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_{11}(s)x_1 + \cdots + \varphi_{1n}(s)x_n| &\leq \mu(N_1 \dots N_{n-1})^{-1} \\ |\varphi_{i2}x_2 \cdots + \varphi_{in}x_n| &\leq \mu N_{i-1} \quad (2 \leq i \leq n). \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

It is a question whether the conditions on $\varphi_{i,j}(s)$ can be removed for $i > 2$.

1.4. **Uniform versions of the equidistribution statement.**

Let the notation be as in §1.1.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\varphi : I \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ be an analytic curve whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace. Let L be a Lie group and Γ be a lattice in L. Let $\rho : G \to L$ be continuous homomorphism. Let $x_0 \in L/\Lambda$ be such that $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})x_0$ is dense in L/Λ. Let $x_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} x_0$ be a convergent sequence in L/Λ. Then for any bounded continuous function f on L/Λ*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1}{|b-a|} \int_a^b f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)))x_i)\, ds = \int_{L/\Lambda} f\, d\mu_L, \tag{1.15}$$

where μ_L is the unique L-invariant probability measure on L/Λ.

For the special case of $L = G$, ρ the identity map, and $m_1 = n-1$, that is $Q_{m_1+1} = G$, we can take any convergent sequence $x_i \to x_0$ in the above theorem.

A more general uniform version is as follows.

Theorem 1.9. *Let the notation be as in Theorem 1.8. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of L/Λ. Then given $\epsilon > 0$ and a bounded continuous function f on L/Λ, there exist finitely many proper closed subgroups $H_1, \dots, H_r$ of L such that for each $1 \leq i \leq r$, $H_i \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in H_i and there exists a compact set*

$$C_i \subset N(H_i, \rho(Q_{m_1+1})) := \{g \in L : \rho(Q_{m_1+1})g \subset gH_i\} \tag{1.16}$$

such that the following holds: Given any compact set

$$F \subset \mathcal{K} \smallsetminus \cup_{i=1}^r C_i\Lambda/\Lambda$$

there exists $i_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in F$ and any $i \geq i_0$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)))x)\, ds - \int_{L/\Lambda} f\, d\mu_L \right| < \epsilon. \tag{1.17}$$

Both the above results in the special case, when for each i all coordinates of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$ are same, were obtained earlier in [19, §1.2].

Acknowledgment. I am very thankful to Shahar Mozes and Elon Lindenstrauss for several helpful discussions. I would also like to thank Dmitry Kleinbock for useful suggestions.

2. Deduction of Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 1.2

By passing to a subsequence we express

$$\mathscr{N} = \{(N_{i,1}, N_{i,2}, \dots, N_{i,k}) \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)^k : i \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{2.1}$$

For proving Theorem 1.3 there is no loss of generality if we apply a permutation of coordinates on $(\mathbb{Z}_+)^k$. Therefore, since there are only finitely many coordinate permutations, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$N_{i,1} \geq N_{i,2} \geq \cdots \geq N_{i,k}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.2}$$

Since $\mathscr{N}$ is infinite, there exists $m_1 \geq 1$ such that after by passing to a subsequence, we may further assume that $N_{i,m_1} \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \infty$, and for each $m_1 < j \leq k$ there exist $N_{0,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $N_{i,j} = N_{0,j}$ for all i. We define

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = (\log N_{i,1}, \dots, \log N_{i,k}) \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^k, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N},$$

and put $\mathscr{T} = (\boldsymbol{\tau}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then $\mathscr{T}$ satisfies the conditions of §1.1. We put

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_0 := (0, \dots, 0, \log N_{0,m_1+1}, \dots, \log N_{0,k}). \tag{2.3}$$

Let $n = k + 1$. We identify the space Ω of unimodular lattices in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$. Given $0 < \mu < 1$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} B_\mu &= \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sup_{1\leq i\leq n} |\xi_i| \leq 1\} \\ K_\mu &= \{\Delta \in \Omega : \Delta \cap B_\mu = \{0\}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

For $(N_1, \dots, N_k) \in \mathscr{N}$, let $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\log N_1, \dots, \log N_k)$. Then for any $s \in I$, $\boldsymbol{x} = (p, q_1, \dots, q_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{x}' = (p_k, \dots, p_1, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, we have

$$\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\varphi(s)))(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}') = \left(\begin{pmatrix} (N_1 \dots N_k)(p + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \varphi_i(s)) \\ N_1^{-1} q_1 \\ \vdots \\ N_k^{-1} q_k \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} N_k(q\varphi_k(s) + p_k) \\ \vdots \\ N_1(q\varphi_1(s) + p_1) \\ (N_1 \dots N_k)^{-1} q \end{pmatrix} \right). \tag{2.5}$$

Therefore (cf. [11, §2.1], [19, §2])

$$\begin{aligned} &(1.11) \text{ is soluble} \iff a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\varphi(s))\boldsymbol{x} \in B_\mu \iff a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\varphi(s))\mathbb{Z}^n \notin K_\mu \\ &(1.12) \text{ is soluble} \iff a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u'(\varphi(s))\boldsymbol{x}' \in B_\mu \iff a'_{\tau} u'(\varphi(s))\mathbb{Z}^n \notin K_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Hence Theorem 1.3 will be proved if we prove the following:

Proposition 2.1. *Put* $x_0 =: (\mathbb{Z}^n, \mathbb{Z}^n) \in \Omega \times \Omega$. *Given* $\mu < 1$, *define*

$$E_\mu := \{s \in [a, b] : \rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)))x_0 \notin K_\mu \times K_\mu \text{ for all large } i\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Then $|E_\mu| = 0$, *where* $|\cdot|$ *denotes the Lebesgue measure.*

In order to deduce this proposition from Theorem 1.2 we need the following result, especially when $m_1 < n - 1 = k$.

We define a compact set

$$K_1 = \cap_{0<\mu<1} K_\mu = \{\Delta \in \Omega : \sup_{1\leq i\leq n} |\xi_i| \geq 1, \forall (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}\} \tag{2.8}$$

Theorem 2.2. $\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0}Q_{m_1+1})x_0 \cap (K_1 \times K_1) \neq \emptyset$.

To prove this we will need the easier inclusion part of the following fact, which was guessed by Minkowski (1896) and proved by Hajós in 1941, see [3, XI.1.3]. Its full strength will be used later for proving Theorem 1.5.

Theorem 2.3. *Let N denotes the group of upper triangular unipotent matrices in* $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$*. Let $\mathcal{W}_n = \{w \in \mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$: w permutes the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n\}$. Then*

$$K_1 = \bigcup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_n} (wNw^{-1})\mathbb{Z}^n. \tag{2.9}$$

□

Proposition 2.4. *Let N^- be the lower triangular unipotent subgroup of* $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$*. Let $(N_1,\dots,N_{n-1}) \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)^{n-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} := (\log N_1,\dots,\log N_{n-1})$. Then*

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}Q_1\Gamma \cap N^-\Gamma \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. For the involutive automorphism σ as defined by (1.7), we have $\sigma(N^-) = N^-$, $\sigma(\Gamma) = \Gamma$, $\sigma(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ and $\sigma(Q_1) = Q'_1$. Therefore it is enough to prove that

$$a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}Q'_1 \cap N^-\Gamma \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.11}$$

We write $k = n-1$. Note that

$$a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}Q'_1 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} N_k & & & \xi_k \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & N_1 & \xi_1 \\ & & & (N_1\dots N_k)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} : \xi_i \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \tag{2.12}$$

We define

$$\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} N_k & & & & 1 \\ N_k - 1 & N_{k-1} & & & 1 \\ N_k - 1 & N_{k-1} - 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & N_1 & 1 \\ N_k - 1 & N_{k-1} - 1 & \dots & N_1 - 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z}). \tag{2.13}$$

We express the matrix γ as a sum of a lower triangular matrix L of determinant 1, and a matrix M with only the last column nonzero. Then we choose $h \in N^-$ such that $hL = \mathrm{diag}(N_1,\dots,N_k,(N_1\dots N_k)^{-1})$. Also hM is a matrix with only the last column nonzero. In particular, $h\gamma = (hL + hM)$ is an upper triangular matrix of determinant 1. Hence $h\gamma \in a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}Q'_1$ by (2.12). This proves (2.11). □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Since $Q_1 \subset Q_{m_1+1}$, by Proposition 2.4 there exist $g \in Q_{m_1+1}$, $h \in N^-$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0}g = h\gamma$. Therefore $\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0}g) = \rho(h)\rho(\gamma)$. Now $\rho(\gamma)x_0 = x_0$ and $\mathfrak{w}N\mathfrak{w}^{-1} = N^-$ for $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$ as in (1.8). Therefore $\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0}g)x_0 = \rho(h)x_0 \in K_1 \times K_1$ by Theorem 2.3. □

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let ρ be as in (1.10). Then the orbit $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})x_0$ is closed and admits a unique $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$-invariant probability measure, say λ. Fix $\mu < 1$. Then $K_\mu \times K_\mu$ contains an open neighbourhood of $K_1 \times K_1$. Therefore by Theorem 2.2, $K_\mu \times K_\mu$ contains a nonempty open subset of $\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0} Q_{m_1+1})x_0$. Therefore there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\lambda(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0})^{-1}(K_\mu \times K_\mu)) > \epsilon. \tag{2.14}$$

So there exists $f \in \mathrm{C_c}(L/\Lambda)$ such that $0 \leq f \leq 1$, $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset K_\mu \times K_\mu$ and

$$\int_{x \in \rho(Q_{m_1+1})x_0} f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0})x)\, d\lambda(x) \geq \epsilon/2. \tag{2.15}$$

Let J be any subinterval of $[a,b]$ with nonempty interior. Then by Theorem 1.2 there exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)))x_0)\, ds \geq \int f(\rho(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0})x)\, d\lambda(x) - \epsilon/4 \geq \epsilon/4. \tag{2.16}$$

Therefore by combining the definition of E_μ and the choice of f we conclude that $|E \cap J| \leq (1-\epsilon/4)|J|$. Since J is an arbitrary open subinterval of I, by the Lebesgue density theorem $|E_\mu| = 0$. □

Thus we have completed the deduction of Theorem 1.3. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. We note that M can be measurably fibered by analytic curves such that almost every curve in the fiber is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Therefore the conclusions of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 hold for almost all points on each of these curves. Therefore by Fubini's theorem, the conclusion of the corollary follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The result follows by the arguments as above. We need to consider only the first factor in (2.5) and $Q_{m_1+1} = G$. Clearly K_μ has strictly positive measure on G/Γ. The only difference is that to conclude (2.16) we need to use [19, Theorem 1.8], where the same conclusion as that of Theorem 1.2 was obtained for the given map φ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = (\tau_i, \ldots, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for each i such that $\tau_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \infty$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Again the deduction of this result is as above, one only considers the first factor. Here by our choice $Q_{m_1+1} = G$ and K_μ has strictly positive measure on G/Γ. Now note that there exists $g_0 \in G$ and an analytic curve $\psi : I \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\varphi(s) = u(\psi(s))g_0$ for all $s \in I$. By our condition, the image of ψ is not contained in any proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We then apply Theorem 1.2 for $x_0 = g_0\mathbb{Z}^n$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let the notation be as in the beginning of this section. Without loss of generality we may assume that (2.2) holds. The only difference is that now the $N_{i,j}$'s are real numbers instead of integers. We may also assume $N_{i,k} \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} N_{0,k}$ and $N_{0,k} \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Let $n = k+1$ and $x_0 = \mathbb{Z}^n \in \Omega$. Then in view of (2.5), considering only the first factor, it is enough to show that there exist $0 < \mu < 1$ and $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} Q_{m_1+1} x_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_\mu = \emptyset, \quad \forall i \geq i_0. \tag{2.17}$$

Since $\mathcal{K}_1 = \bigcap_{0<\mu<1} \mathcal{K}_\mu$, it is enough to show that

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0} Q_{m_1+1} x_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_1 = \emptyset. \tag{2.18}$$

Suppose if this intersection is nonempty, then by Theorem 2.3 due to Minkowski and Hajós,

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0} Q_{m_1+1} \cap \mathcal{W}_n N \Gamma \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.19}$$

Applying σ on both sides, we get

$$a'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0} Q'_{m_1+1} \cap \mathcal{W}_n N \Gamma \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.20}$$

Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since $Q'_{m_1+1} e_1 = e_1$ and $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0} e_1 = N_{0,k}$, there exist $\boldsymbol{v} = q_1 e_1 + \cdots + q_n e_n \in \Gamma e_1 \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$, $w \in \mathcal{W}_n$ and $g = (x_{ij}) \in N$ such that

$$N_{0,n-1} e_1 = w g \boldsymbol{v}. \tag{2.21}$$

Let $1 \leq r \leq n$ be such that $w^{-1} e_1 = e_r$. Then we have

$$N_{0,n-1} = q_r + \sum_{j>r} x_{ij} q_j \tag{2.22}$$

$$0 = q_i + \sum_{j>i} x_{ij} q_j \quad (i > r). \tag{2.23}$$

Putting $i = n$ in (2.23) we get that $q_n = 0$. Now for any $i_0 > r$, if $q_j = 0$ for all $j > i_0$ then putting $i = i_0$ in (2.23) we get that $q_{i_0} = 0$. Therefore by induction $q_j = 0$ for all $j > r$. Therefore (2.22) becomes $N_{0,n-1} = q_r \in \mathbb{Z}$, a contradiction. This shows that the intersection in (2.18) cannot be nonempty, and the proof is complete. ☐

Now we begin the proof of the main Theorem 1.2.

3. Nondivergence of translates

Let the notation be as in §1.1 and the statement of Theorem 1.2. We consider the action of G on L/Λ via the homomorphism ρ; that is, for any $x \in L/\Lambda$ and $g \in G$, we have $gx := \rho(g)x$. Let $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in L/Λ such that $x_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} x_0$. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ define μ_i to be the probability measure on L/Λ as

$$\int_{L/\Lambda} f \, d\mu_i := \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I f(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)) x_i) \, ds, \quad \forall f \in \mathrm{C_c}(L/\Lambda). \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $\mathcal{F} \subset L/\Lambda$ such that $\mu_i(\mathcal{F}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all large $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In the case of $L = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, ρ the identity map, and $\Lambda = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, the result was obtained by Kleinbock and Margulis [10].

3.1. Let $\mathscr{H}$ denote the collection of analytic subgroups H of G such that $H \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in H and a unipotent one-parameter subgroup of H acts ergodically with respect to the H-invariant probability measure on $H/H \cap \Lambda$. Then $\mathscr{H}$ is a countable collection [13, 16].

Let $\mathfrak{l}$ denote the Lie algebra associated to L. Let $V = \oplus_{d=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{l}} \wedge^d \mathfrak{l}$ and consider the $(\oplus_{d=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{l}} \wedge^d \mathrm{Ad})$-action of L on V. Given $H \in \mathscr{H}$, let $\mathfrak{h}$ denote its Lie algebra, and fix $p_H \in \wedge^{\dim \mathfrak{h}} \mathfrak{h} \smallsetminus \{0\} \subset V$. Let $\mathrm{N_L}(H)$ denote the normalizer of H in L. Then

$$\mathrm{Stab}_L(p_H) = \mathrm{N}^1_{\mathrm{L}}(H) := \{g \in \mathrm{N_L}(H) : \det((\mathrm{Ad}\, g)|_{\mathfrak{h}}) = 1\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.2 ([6]). *The orbit $\Lambda \cdot p_H$ is a discrete subset of V.* □

Consider the G action on V via ρ; that is $gv = \rho(g)v$ for all $g \in G$ and $v \in V$. Given a sequence $\mathscr{T}$ as in §1.1, we define

$$\begin{aligned} V^-_{\mathscr{T}} &= \{v \in V : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} v \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0\}, \quad V^+_{\mathscr{T}} = \{v \in V : a^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} v \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0\} \\ V^0_{\mathscr{T}} &= \{\in V : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} v \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} v_1 \text{ and } a^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} v \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} v_2 \text{ for some } v_1, v_2 \in V\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Since $\{a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} : \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}$ acts on V by $\mathbb{R}$-diagonalizable commuting automorphisms, by passing to a subsequence of $\mathscr{T}$, we have

$$V = V^-_{\mathscr{T}} \oplus V^0_{\mathscr{T}} \oplus V^+_{\mathscr{T}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $\pi^{\mathscr{T}}_0 : V \to V^0_{\mathscr{T}}$ denote the corresponding projection.

3.2. **Margulis-Dani non-diverergence criterion.** We recall the following criterion based on [5, 17, 10]. Here we use the information that φ is an analytic map.

Proposition 3.3 ([19, Prop.3.4]). *There exists a finite collection $\mathscr{W} \subset \mathscr{H}$ (depending only on L and Λ) such that the following holds: Given $\epsilon > 0$ and $R > 0$, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{F} \subset L/\Lambda$ such that for any $h_1, h_2 \in L$ and a subinterval $J \subset I$, one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

I) *There exists $\gamma \in \Lambda$ and $W \in \mathscr{W}$ such that*

$$\sup_{s\in J} \|h_1 u(\varphi(s)) h_2 p_W\| < R.$$

II) $\frac{1}{|J|} |\{s \in J : h_1 u(\varphi(s)) h_2 \Lambda/\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}\}| \geq 1 - \epsilon.$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $g_0 \in L$ such that $x_0 = g_0\Lambda$. Take a sequence $R_k \xrightarrow{k\to\infty} 0$ of positive reals. Suppose that Theorem 3.1 fails to hold for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any $R > 0$ and any compact set $\mathcal{F}$ and infinitely many $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the condition (II) of Proposition 3.3 fails to hold for $J = I$, $h_1 = a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}$ and $h_2 = g_0$; and hence the condition (I) holds. Therefore after passing to subsequences, there exists $W \in \mathscr{H}$, and for each i there exists $\gamma_i \in \Lambda$ such that

$$\sup_{s\in I} \|a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s)) g_0 \gamma_i p_W\| \leq R_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0. \tag{3.5}$$

By Proposition 3.2, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $\|g_0\gamma_i p_W\| \geq r_0$ for each i. We put $v_i = g_0\gamma_i p_W / \|g_0\gamma_i p_W\|$. Then

$$\sup_{s\in I}\|a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\varphi(s))v_i\| \leq R_i/\|g_0\gamma_i p_W\| \leq R_i/r_0 \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0. \tag{3.6}$$

After passing to a subsequence $v_i \to v \in V$ and $\|v\| = 1$. Now from (3.3), (3.4) and (3.6) we deduce that

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^-_{\mathscr{T}}, \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{3.7}$$

A main result on linear dynamics proved in the next section, namely Corollary 4.9, in view of Lemma 4.1 states that: *For any finite dimensional linear representation V of G, any $v \in V \smallsetminus \{0\}$ and any $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,*

$$\textit{if } u(e)v \in V^-_{\mathscr{T}} + V^0_{\mathscr{T}} \textit{ for all } e \in \mathcal{B} \textit{ then } \pi_0^{\mathscr{T}}(u(e)v) \neq 0 \textit{ for all } e \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{3.8}$$

Since $\{\varphi(s) : s \in I\}$ is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, (3.7) implies the *if* condition of (3.8) but contradicts its implication. □

From Theorem 3.1 we deduce the following:

Corollary 3.4. *After passing to a subsequence, $\mu_i \to \mu$ as $i \to \infty$ in the space of probability measures on L/Λ with respect to the weak-$*$ topology; that is,*

$$\int_{L/\Lambda} f\, d\mu_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \int_{L/\Lambda} f\, d\mu, \quad \forall f \in \mathrm{C_c}(L/\Lambda). \tag{3.9}$$

4. Dynamics of the intertwined linear actions of various $\mathrm{SL}(m,\mathbb{R})'s$ contained in G

In this section will give proofs of the new technical results of this article, including the one used above. We will also derive their further consequences, which will be crucially needed for applying the linearization techniques in combination with Ratner's theorem, in order to describe the limit measure μ in later sections.

4.1. **Layered presentation for the infinite sequence $\mathscr{T}$.** Let $\mathscr{T} = (\boldsymbol{\tau}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an unbounded sequence as in §1.1; that is, $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = (\tau_{i,1}, \ldots, \tau_{i,n}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\tau_{i,1} \geq \tau_{i,2} \geq \cdots \geq \tau_{i,n} \geq 0$. By passing to a subsequence we may further assume that there exist $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and integers $n-1 > m_1 > m_2 > \cdots > m_k \geq 1$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{i\to\infty} \tau_{i,r} &< \infty \quad (m_1 < r \leq n-1)\\
\lim_{i\to\infty} \tau_{i,m_1} &= \infty\\
\lim_{i\to\infty} (\tau_{i,m_{\ell+1}} - \tau_{i,m_\ell}) &= \infty \quad (1 \leq \ell \leq k-1)\\
\lim_{i\to\infty} (\tau_{i,r} - \tau_{i,m_\ell}) &< \infty \quad (m_{\ell+1} < r \leq m_\ell,\ 1 \leq \ell \leq k),
\end{aligned}$$

where $m_{k+1} = 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\tau}_{i,r} &= 0 \quad (m_1 < r \leq n-1)\\ \bar{\tau}_{i,r} &= \tau_{i,m_\ell} \quad (m_{\ell+1} < r \leq m_\ell,\ 1 \leq \ell \leq k)\\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i &= (\bar{\tau}_{i,1}, \dots, \bar{\tau}_{i,n-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Then $\lim_{i\to\infty}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}t_{i,1} &= \bar{\tau}_{i,m_1}\\ t_{i,\ell} &= \bar{\tau}_{i,m_\ell} - \bar{\tau}_{i,m_{\ell-1}} \quad (2 \leq \ell \leq k)\\ \boldsymbol{t}_i &= (t_{i,1}, \dots, t_{i,k}) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^k.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain a sequence $\mathcal{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ associated to the given sequence $\mathscr{T}$ as above. Now $t_{i,\ell} \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \infty$ $(1 \leq \ell \leq k)$.

4.2. **Notation and set up.** We are given natural numbers n, $k < n$ and $n - 1 \geq m_1 > \cdots > m_k \geq 1$. Let $E_{i,j}$ denote the $n \times n$-matrix with 1 in the (i,j)-th coordinate and 0 in the rest. For $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}_\ell = m_\ell E_{1,1} - \sum_{j=2}^{m_\ell+1} E_{j,j}. \tag{4.1}$$

Given $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, let $\mathcal{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_i)_{i=1}^\infty \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^\ell$ be a sequence such that each coordinate of $\boldsymbol{t}_i$ tends to infinity as $i \to \infty$. For $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, define

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}) := t_1\mathcal{A}_1 + \cdots + t_\ell\mathcal{A}_\ell. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that for the sequences $\mathscr{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ as described in §4.1, we have

$$a_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i} = \exp(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i)), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.3}$$

Let V be a finite dimensional linear representation of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$.

For $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, we define

$$V_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \{v \in V : \mathcal{A}_i v = \mu_i v \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Thus if $v \in V_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ then $\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t})v = (\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t})v$. The set $\Delta_\ell := \{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell : V_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \neq 0\}$ is finite, and

$$V = \oplus_{\boldsymbol{\nu}\in\Delta_\ell} V_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} : V \to V_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ denote the corresponding projection. We put

$$\Delta := \Delta_k. \tag{4.6}$$

We define

$$
\begin{aligned}
V^-(\mathcal{T}) &= \{v \in V : \exp(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i))v \overset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\} \\
&= \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\Delta_\ell : \lim_{i\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{t}_i = -\infty\}} V_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \\
V^+(\mathcal{T}) &= \{v \in V : \exp(-\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i))v \overset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\} \\
&= \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\Delta_\ell : \lim_{i\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{t}_i = \infty\}} V_{\mu} \qquad (4.7)\\
V^0(\mathcal{T}) &= \left\{v \in V : \begin{array}{l} \text{both } \exp(-\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i))v \text{ and } \exp(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i))v \\ \text{converge in } V \text{ as } i \to \infty \end{array}\right\} \\
&= \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\Delta_\ell : |\lim_{i\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{t}_i| < \infty\}} V_{\mu}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then after passing to a subsequence of $\mathcal{T}$, we have

$$V = V^+(\mathcal{T}) \oplus V^0(\mathcal{T}) \oplus V^-(\mathcal{T}). \qquad (4.8)$$

Let $\pi_0^{\mathcal{T}} : V \to V^0(\mathcal{T})$ denote the corresponding projection.

In view of (4.3) we have the following:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathscr{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be as defined in §4.1. Let $V^-_{\mathscr{T}}$, $V^+_{\mathscr{T}}$ and $V^0_{\mathscr{T}}$ be as defined in* (3.3)*. Then*

$$V^-_{\mathscr{T}} = V^+(\mathcal{T}), \quad V^0_{\mathscr{T}} = V^0(\mathcal{T}) \quad \textit{and} \quad V^+_{\mathscr{T}} = V^0(\mathcal{T}).$$

In particular, the corresponding projections $\pi_0^{\mathscr{T}} = \pi_0^{\mathcal{T}}$. □

4.3. **Main Result.** In the following discussion, let $\mathcal{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_i)_{i=1}^\infty \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^k$, where $k \geq 2$ is a sequence such that (each coordinate of $\boldsymbol{t}_i)\overset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty$ and $V = V^0(\mathcal{T}) \oplus V^+(\mathcal{T}) \oplus V^-(\mathcal{T})$. For $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, let $\boldsymbol{t}' = (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$. Given $\mathcal{T}$ as above, let

$$\mathcal{T}' = (\boldsymbol{t}'_i)_{i=1}^\infty \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^{k-1}. \qquad (4.9)$$

Proposition 4.2 (Basic Lemma-II)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$; that is, $\{e' - e : e' \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for any $e \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose that $v \in V$ is such that*

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall\, e \in \mathcal{B}. \qquad (4.10)$$

Then for any $e \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}'). \qquad (4.11)$$

Moreover for any $e \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\textit{if } \pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(u(e)v) \neq 0 \textit{ then } \pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(\pi(u(e)v)) \neq 0. \qquad (4.12)$$

The rest of §4.3 is devoted to the proof of this proposition.

4.3.1. *Notation.* Let $\mathfrak{c} = \operatorname{span}\{\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k\}$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ denote the Lie algebra generated by elements

$$E_{1,1},\ E_{1,j},\ E_{j,1},\ E_{j,j}, \quad \text{where } 2 \le j \le m_k + 1. \tag{4.13}$$

Then $\mathfrak{h}$ is naturally isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(m_k + 1, \mathbb{R})$. Since $[\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{h}] = \mathfrak{h}$, we have that $\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h}$ is a reductive subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h}) \oplus \mathfrak{h}$, where $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h})$ denotes the centralizer of $\mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{c}$.

We define a preorder $\preceq$ on Δ by

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} \preceq \boldsymbol{\nu} \iff (\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \le \boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{T}). \tag{4.14}$$

By passing to a subsequence of $\mathcal{T}$ we may assume that $\preceq$ is a total preorder. Note that ($\boldsymbol{\mu} \preceq \boldsymbol{\nu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu} \preceq \boldsymbol{\mu}$) does not imply $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}$.

For $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we define $\boldsymbol{\mu}' = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$.

Lemma 4.3 (Positivity Lemma). *Let W be an irreducible $(\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h})$-submodule of V. Let*

$$\Delta(W) := \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Delta : \pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(W) \neq 0\}. \tag{4.15}$$

Then for any $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W)$ and $\boldsymbol{t} \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^k$, where $k \ge 2$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \ge \boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \iff \mu_k \ge \nu_k \iff \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' \ge \boldsymbol{\nu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}', \tag{4.16}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Proof. In view of the expression $\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h}) + \mathfrak{h}$, for any $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}) = z(\boldsymbol{t}') + (f(\boldsymbol{t}') + t_k)\mathcal{A}_k \tag{4.17}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}') = z(\boldsymbol{t}') + f(\boldsymbol{t}')\mathcal{A}_k, \tag{4.18}$$

where $z(\boldsymbol{t}') \in \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h})$ and

$$f(\boldsymbol{t}') = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \frac{m_\ell + 1}{m_k + 1} t_\ell. \tag{4.19}$$

Here we observe that since $k \ge 2$,

$$\boldsymbol{t}' \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{k-1} \implies f(\boldsymbol{t}') > 0. \tag{4.20}$$

Since the action of $\mathfrak{c}$ is via commuting $\mathbb{R}$-diagonalizable elements and W is an irreducible $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h}) + \mathfrak{h}$-module, the center $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{h})$ of $\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h}$ acts on W by scalers. Therefore for each $\boldsymbol{t} \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^k$, there exists a constants $c(\boldsymbol{t}') \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$z(\boldsymbol{t}')w = c(\boldsymbol{t}')w, \quad \forall w \in W. \tag{4.21}$$

For any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Delta(W)$, there exists $0 \neq w \in \pi^{\mathcal{T}}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(W) \subset W$. Now

$$(\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t})w = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t})w = z(\boldsymbol{t}')w + (f(\boldsymbol{t}') + t_k)\mathcal{A}_k w \tag{4.22}$$

$$= (c(\boldsymbol{t}') + (f(\boldsymbol{t}') + t_k)\mu_k)w, \tag{4.23}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} = \mu_1 t_1 + \dots + \mu_k t_k$. Similarly,

$$(\boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}')w = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}')w = (c(\boldsymbol{t}') + f(\boldsymbol{t}')\mu_k)w. \tag{4.24}$$

Therefore, since $w \neq 0$,

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} = c(\boldsymbol{t}') + (f(\boldsymbol{t}') + t_k)\mu_k \tag{4.25}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' = c(\boldsymbol{t}') + f(\boldsymbol{t}')\mu_k. \tag{4.26}$$

Therefore, since $f(\boldsymbol{t}') > 0$, for any $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W)$,

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \geq \boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \Longleftrightarrow \mu_k \geq \nu_k \Longleftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' \geq \boldsymbol{\nu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}'. \tag{4.27}$$

□

Notation. We express $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} = \mathbb{R}^{m_k} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_k}$ and let $q : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$ and $q_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_k}$ denote the associated projections. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{W} &= \{\omega \in \mathrm{N_G}(u(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})) : \exp(t\mathcal{A}_k)\omega\exp(-t\mathcal{A}_k) \overset{t\to\infty}{\to} e\} \\ &= \left\{\omega(w) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & I_{m_k} & w \\ & & I_{n-1-m_k} \end{bmatrix} : w \in M(m_k \times (n-1-m_k), \mathbb{R})\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ be such that $q(\mathcal{E})$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m_k}$. Then there exists $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ such that*

$$\omega u(e)\omega^{-1} = u(q(e)), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{4.29}$$

Proof. We fix the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_k}$, and consider the basis $q(\mathcal{E})$ of $\mathbb{R}^{m_k}$. Then there exists a unique

$$w \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^{m_k}, \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_k}) \cong M(m_k \times (n-1-m_k), \mathbb{R}) \tag{4.30}$$

such that $w(q(e)) = q_\perp(e)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\omega(w) \in \mathfrak{W}$ satisfies (4.29). □

Lemma 4.5. *For any $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ the following holds:*

$$\omega(V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T})) \subset V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}) \tag{4.31}$$

$$x \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}) \Leftrightarrow \pi_0^{\mathcal{T}}(x) = \pi_0^{\mathcal{T}}(\omega x) \tag{4.32}$$

$$\omega(V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}')) \subset V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}') \tag{4.33}$$

$$x \in V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}'),\ \pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(x) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(\omega x) \neq 0. \tag{4.34}$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{w}$ denote the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ associated to $\mathfrak{W}$. Then $\mathfrak{w}$ is contained in the sum of strictly negative eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{T}))$ acting on $\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore (4.31) and (4.32) hold.

Similarly (4.33) and (4.34) hold, because $\mathfrak{w}$ is contained in the sum of zero eigenspaces and strictly negative eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$ acting on $\mathfrak{g}$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq k-1$. □

One of the crucial ingredients in the proof of Proposition 4.2 is following 'Basic Lemma-I' [19, Proposition 4.2].

Proposition 4.6. *Let $m \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{diag}(m, -1, \dots, -1) \in \mathfrak{sl}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$. For any $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let $u(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \boldsymbol{x} \\ 0 & I_m \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathfrak{sl}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$. Let W be a finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SL}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$. Let W^- (respectively W^+) be the sum of strictly negative (respectively positive) eigenspaces of $\mathcal{A}$ and W^0 be the null space of $\mathcal{A}$. Let*

$\pi_0 : W \to W^0$ denote the projection parallel to $W^- \oplus W^+$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ be an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $w \in W$. Suppose that

$$u(e)w \in W^0 + W^-, \quad \forall e \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1. \tag{4.35}$$

Then

$$\pi_0(u(e)w) \neq 0, \quad \forall e \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1. \tag{4.36}$$

□

Corollary 4.7. *In Proposition 4.6, suppose further that $\pi_0(u(e_0)w)$ is fixed by $\mathrm{SL}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$ for some $e_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$. Then w is fixed by $\mathrm{SL}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Let $w_0 = u(e_0)w - \pi_0(u(e_0)w)$. Put $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2 = \{e - e_0 : \bar{\mathcal{B}}_2\}$. Then $u(e')w_0 \in V^0 + V^-$ for all $e' \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$. Since $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$ is an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$, by Proposition 4.6, if $w_0 \neq 0$ then $\pi_0(w_0) \neq 0$, which contradicts the choice of w_0. Therefore $w_0 = 0$. Hence $u(e_0)w = \pi_0(u(e_0)w)$ is fixed by $\mathrm{SL}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$. In turn, w is fixed by $\mathrm{SL}(m+1, \mathbb{R})$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Let $e_0 \in \mathcal{B}$. We want to prove (4.11) and (4.12) for e_0 in place of e. By replacing v by $u(e_0)v$ and replacing every element $e \in \mathcal{B}$ by $e - e_0$, without loss of generality we may assume that $e_0 = 0$. Let $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{B}$ containing 0 such that $q(\mathcal{B}_1) \setminus \{0\}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m_k}$. By Lemma 4.4 there exists $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ such that

$$\omega u(e) \omega^{-1} = u(q(e)) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}_1. \tag{4.37}$$

We put $v_0 := \omega v$. Then by (4.10), (4.31) and (4.37), we have

$$u(q(e))v_0 = \omega(u(e)v) \subset V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}_1. \tag{4.38}$$

By (4.34), if $\pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(v) \neq 0$ then $\pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(v_0) \neq 0$. By (4.32), if $\pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(v_0) \neq 0$ then $\pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(v) \neq 0$. Therefore by (4.33), in order to prove (4.11) and (4.12), it is enough to show that

$$v_0 = \omega v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}'), \quad \text{and} \tag{4.39}$$

$$\text{if } \pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}'}(v_0) \neq 0 \text{ then } \pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(v_0) \neq 0. \tag{4.40}$$

We decompose V into irreducible $(\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h})$-submodules as

$$V = W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s. \tag{4.41}$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $P_j : V \to W_j$ denote the associate projection, which is $(\mathfrak{c} + \mathfrak{h})$-equivariant. To show the validity of (4.39) and (4.40) it is enough to prove that for every $1 \leq j \leq s$,

$$P_j(v_0) \in V^0(\mathcal{T}') + V^-(\mathcal{T}'), \quad \text{and} \tag{4.42}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_k \cdot P_j(\pi_{\mathbf{0}'}^{\mathcal{T}'}(v_0)) = 0. \tag{4.43}$$

Now onwards we will fix j as above, and put $W = W_j$ and $P = P_j$.

Without loss of generality we may suppose that $P(v_0) \neq 0$. Let

$$\Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1) = \{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W) : \pi_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(P(u(q(e))v_0)) \neq 0 \quad \text{for some } e \in \mathcal{B}_1\}. \tag{4.44}$$

We now recall that by (4.38) we have

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \leq 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1), \ \forall \boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{4.45}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be the maximal element of $\Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1) \neq \emptyset$ with respect to the total preorder defined on Δ; that is,

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} \leq \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{T},\ \forall \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1). \tag{4.46}$$

Therefore by Lemma 4.3, for all $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1)$ we have

$$\nu_k \leq \mu_k \quad \text{and} \tag{4.47}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' \leq \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{4.48}$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$W_\lambda = \{w \in W : \mathcal{A}_k w = \lambda w\}. \tag{4.49}$$

Then for any $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k) \in \Delta$,

$$\pi_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(P(u(q(e))v_0) \in W_{\nu_k}. \tag{4.50}$$

Hence by (4.44), (4.47), and (4.50) we conclude that

$$u(q(e))P(v_0) = P(u(q(e))v_0) \in \sum_{\lambda \leq \mu_k} W_\lambda, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}_1. \tag{4.51}$$

Let H be the Lie subgroup of G associated to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$. Then H is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(m_k + 1, \mathbb{R})$. We now apply Proposition 4.6 in the case of $m = m_k$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_k$, $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1 = q(\mathcal{B}_1)$ and $w = P(v_0)$. Note that if $\mu_k < 0$, then by (4.51) we have

$$u(\bar{e})w \in W^-, \quad \forall \bar{e} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1. \tag{4.52}$$

Therefore the condition (4.35) of Proposition 4.6 is satisfied but its conclusion (4.36) fails to hold. Thus we conclude that

$$\mu_k \geq 0. \tag{4.53}$$

Therefore for any $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{T}$, by (4.45), we have

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' = \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t} - \mu_k t_k \leq 0. \tag{4.54}$$

Then from (4.48) we conclude that

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' \leq \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}' \leq 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1),\ \forall \boldsymbol{t}' \in \mathcal{T}'. \tag{4.55}$$

Now in view of (4.44) this implies (4.42).

Next in order to prove (4.43), suppose that $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Delta(W, \mathcal{B}_1)$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}' = \mathbf{0}'$. We need to show that $\boldsymbol{\nu} = 0$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By (4.55),

$$0 = \boldsymbol{\nu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}_i' \leq \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}_i' \leq 0. \tag{4.56}$$

Therefore, by (4.53) and since $\boldsymbol{t}_{i,k} > 0$,

$$0 \geq \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu}' \cdot \boldsymbol{t}_i' + \mu_k t_{i,k} \geq 0, \tag{4.57}$$

and hence

$$\mu_k = 0. \tag{4.58}$$

Therefore by (4.26) and (4.56), applied first to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, and to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, we get

$$f(\boldsymbol{t}_i')\nu_k = \boldsymbol{\nu}'\cdot\boldsymbol{t}_i' - c(\boldsymbol{t}_i') = -c(\boldsymbol{t}_i') = f(\boldsymbol{t}')\mu_k - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\cdot\boldsymbol{t}_i' = 0. \tag{4.59}$$

Since $f(\boldsymbol{t}_i') > 0$, we conclude that $\boldsymbol{\nu} = 0$. □

4.4. **Consequences of the Basic Lemma-II.** For any $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ and $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ define $\boldsymbol{t}(\ell) = (t_1, \dots, t_\ell)$, and $\mathcal{T}(\ell) = (\boldsymbol{t}_i(\ell))_{i=1}^\infty$, where $\mathcal{T} = (\boldsymbol{t}_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $\boldsymbol{t}_i \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^k$, each coordinate of $\boldsymbol{t}_i$ tends to infinity as $i \to \infty$. By passing to a subsequence we will further assume that

$$V = V^-(\mathcal{T}(\ell)) \oplus V^0(\mathcal{T}(\ell)) \oplus V^-(\mathcal{T}(\ell)) \quad (1 \leq \ell \leq k). \tag{4.60}$$

By applying Proposition 4.2 repeatedly, we can decrease k, and obtain the following:

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $v \in V$ be such that*

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall\, e \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{4.61}$$

Then for any $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, and any $e \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}(\ell)) + V^-(\mathcal{T}(\ell)), \quad \textit{and} \tag{4.62}$$

$$\textit{if } \pi_{\mathbf{0}(\ell)}^{\mathcal{T}(\ell)}(u(e)v) \neq 0 \textit{ then } \pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(u(e)v) \neq 0. \tag{4.63}$$

□

By specializing this result to the case of $\ell = 1$, we deduce the following generalization of Proposition 4.6.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $v \in V$ be such that*

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall\, e \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{4.64}$$

Then

$$\pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(u(e)v) \neq 0, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{4.65}$$

Proof. By (4.62) Proposition 4.8 applied to $\ell = 1$ we get

$$u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}(1)) + V^-(\mathcal{T}(1)), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{4.66}$$

Take any $e_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ and choose $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{B}$ containing e_0 such that $q(\mathcal{B}_1)$ is an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m_1}$. Let $\mathfrak{W}$ be defined as in (4.28) associated to $\mathcal{A}_1$ in place of $\mathcal{A}_k$. Then by Lemma 4.4 there exists $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ such that $\omega u(e - e_0)\omega^{-1} = u(q(e - e_0))$ for all $e \in \mathcal{B}_1$. Therefore

$$u(q(e - e_0))(\omega u(e_0)v) \in V^0(\mathcal{T}(1)) + V^-(\mathcal{T}(1)), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{B}_1. \tag{4.67}$$

Therefore by Proposition 4.6 applied to $m = m_1$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1$, $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1 = \{q(e - e_0) : e \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$ and $w = \omega u(e_0)v$, we get

$$\pi_{\mathbf{0}(1)}^{\mathcal{T}(1)}(\omega u(e_0)v) \neq 0. \tag{4.68}$$

Therefore in view of (4.31) of Lemma 4.5 for $\mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ defined for the case of $k = 1$, we get

$$\pi_{\mathbf{0}(1)}^{\mathcal{T}(1)}(u(e_0)v) = \pi_{\mathbf{0}(1)}^{\mathcal{T}(1)}(\omega u(e_0)v) \neq 0. \tag{4.69}$$

Now from (4.63) of Proposition 4.8 we conclude that $\pi_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathcal{T}}(u(e_0)v) \neq 0$. ☐

Corollary 4.10. *Let* $\mathcal{T} \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^k$ *be as in §4.3. Assume that* $m_1 = n-1$. *Let* $\varphi : I = [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ *be a differentiable curve whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace of* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. *Let* $v \in V$ *be such that*

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}). \tag{4.70}$$

Then v *is* G*-fixed.*

Proof. Given any $s_0 \in I$, there exists a set $\{s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1}\} \subset I$ such that $\mathcal{B} := \{\varphi(s_i) : 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ is an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Therefore by (4.62) of Proposition 4.8 applied to $\ell = 1$ we get

$$u(\varphi(s_0))v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}(1)) + V^-(\mathcal{T}(1)). \tag{4.71}$$

Therefore by [19, Cor. 4.6] G fixes v. ☐

We will now generalize the above result for all $1 \leq m_1 \leq n-1$.

Proposition 4.11. *Let* $\mathcal{T} \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^k$ *be as §4.3. Let* $\varphi : I = [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ *be a differentiable curve which is not contained in a proper affine subspace of* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. *Let* $v \in V$ *be such that*

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{4.72}$$

Then v *is fixed by the subgroup* Q_{m_1+1}.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $v \neq 0$. In view of Proposition 4.8

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^0(\mathcal{T}(1)) + V^-(\mathcal{T}(1)), \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{4.73}$$

At this stage we will take $k = 1$ and replace $\mathcal{T}$ by $\mathcal{T}(1)$. Let $L = \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$, $L^\perp = \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_1}$, and $q : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to L$ and $q_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to L^\perp$ be the projections associated to the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} = L \oplus L^\perp$.

Take any $s_0 \in I$ and put $e_0 = \varphi(s_0)$. Due to the hypothesis on φ there exists a finite set $\mathcal{E} \subset \varphi(I)$ containing e_0 such that $\{q(e) - q(e_0) : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is not contained in a union of (m_1+1) proper subspaces of L.

Let $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{E}$ containing e_0 be such that the set $\{q(e) - q(e_0) : e \in \mathcal{B}_1 \smallsetminus \{e_0\}\}$ is a basis of L. Let $\mathfrak{W}$ be defined as in (4.28) for $k = 1$. Then there exists $\omega \in \mathfrak{W}$ such that $\omega u(e - e_0)\omega^{-1} = u(q(e-e_0))$ for all $e \in \mathcal{B}_1$. We put $v_0 = u(e_0)v$. Now by (4.73) and (4.31) for the case of $k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(q(e-e_0))\omega v_0 &= \omega u(e-e_0)v_0 \\ &= \omega u(e)v \in V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) \oplus V^-(\mathcal{A}_1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.74}$$

Let $H \cong \mathrm{SL}(m_1+1, \mathbb{R})$ be the Lie group associated to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ as defined through (4.13) for $k = 1$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{q(e-e_0) : e \in \mathcal{B}_1 \smallsetminus \{e_0\}\}$. Let $D_{\mathcal{C}}$ consist of those $g \in Z_H(\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1))$ such that for each $e' \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $gu(e')g^{-1} = u(\lambda e')$ for some $\lambda > 0$; cf. [19, eq.(4.48)]. Then by [19, Prop.2.3], for all $e \in \mathcal{B}_1$,

$$\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega u(e)v) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathrm{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega u(e)v)). \tag{4.75}$$

By (4.32), applied to the case of $k = 1$, $\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega v_0) = \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0)$, and hence

$$\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0)). \tag{4.76}$$

This equation holds for all choices of $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{E}$ containing e_0 such that $q(\mathcal{B}_1)$ spans L; here it is important that (4.76) does not involve ω. Therefore in view of the hypothesis on $\mathcal{E}$, by [19, Cor.2.4] we can deduce that

$$\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \tag{4.77}$$

$$Z_H(\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)) \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0)). \tag{4.78}$$

Next we want to show that

$$u(\lambda q(\dot{\varphi}(s))) \in \operatorname{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s)v))), \quad \forall s \in I \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.79}$$

To see this, put $a(t) = \exp(t\mathcal{A}_1)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, we define $a(t) \cdot \xi$ by the relation $u(a(t) \cdot \xi) = a(t)u(\xi)a(t)^{-1}$. Then $a(t) \cdot q(\xi) = e^{m_1 t}q(\xi)$, $a(t) \cdot q_\perp(\xi) = e^{(m_1-1)t}q_\perp(\xi)$, and hence

$$e^{-m_1 t}a(t) \cdot \xi \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} q(\xi). \tag{4.80}$$

Take $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \infty$. Put $s_i = s + \lambda e^{-m_1 t_i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a(t_i)u(\varphi(s_i))v &= \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s_i)) + a(t_i)\pi_-^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s_i))) \\ &\xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.81}$$

Also $a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))v \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s))v)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s) &= (s_i - s)\dot{\varphi}(s) + O((s_i - s)^2) \\ &= e^{-m_1 t_i}\dot{\varphi}(s) + O(e^{-2m_1 t_i}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.82}$$

by (4.80),

$$a_i \cdot (\varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s_0)) \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \lambda q(\dot{\varphi}(s)). \tag{4.83}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} a_i u(\varphi(s_i))v &= a_i u(\varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s))u(\varphi(s))v \\ &= u(a_i \cdot (\varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s)))a_i u(\varphi(s))v \\ &\xrightarrow{i\to\infty} u(\lambda q(\dot{\varphi}(s)))\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(u(\varphi(s))v). \end{aligned} \tag{4.84}$$

Thus (4.79) follows from (4.81) and (4.84).

Due to our hypothesis on $\varphi(s)$, we could choose $s_0 \in I$ such that $q(\dot{\varphi}(s_0)) \neq 0$. Let Q denote the subgroup of H generated by $Z_H(\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1))$ and $u(\mathbb{R}q(\dot{\varphi}(s_0)))$. It may be verified that Q is a parabolic subgroup of H. By (4.77) and (4.79), $Q \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1})$. Therefore we conclude that

$$H \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0)). \tag{4.85}$$

Therefore H fixes $\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega v_0) = \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}_1}(v_0)$. Now by (4.74) and Corollary 4.7 we conclude that

$$H \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\omega v_0). \tag{4.86}$$

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_{m_1}\}$ denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{m_1} = L \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Note that any $z \in Z_H(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)$ acts on $e \in L$ via the relation $u(z \cdot e) = zu(e)z^{-1}$. This action of $Z_H(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)$ surjects onto $\mathrm{GL}(m_1, \mathbb{R})$. Therefore there exists $z \in \mathbb{Z}_H(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)$ such that

$$\{z \cdot q(e - e_0) : e \in \mathcal{B}_1\} = \{0, e_1, \dots, e_{m_1}\}. \tag{4.87}$$

Since $\omega \in Q_{m_1+1}$, and

$$z\omega(V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) + V^-(\mathcal{A}_1)) = V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) + V^-(\mathcal{A}_1), \tag{4.88}$$

replacing $\varphi(s)$ by the curve $\varphi_1(s)$ such that

$$z\omega u(\varphi(s) - e_0)\omega^{-1}z^{-1} = u(\varphi_1(s)), \quad \forall s \in I, \tag{4.89}$$

and replacing v by $z\omega v_0$, and $\mathcal{B}_1$ by $\{0, e_1, \dots, e_{m_1}\}$, without loss of generality we may assume the following:

$$H \cdot v = v, \quad \text{and} \quad u(\varphi(s))v \in V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) + V^-(\mathcal{A}_1), \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{4.90}$$

Let $q_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}e_{m_1+1}$ denote the coordinate projection. Put

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi(s) : s \in I,\ q_1(\varphi(s)) \neq 0\}, \text{ then } L^\perp = \operatorname{span}(\{q_\perp(e) : e \in \mathcal{F}\}). \tag{4.91}$$

Now take any $e \in \mathcal{F}$. Then there exists $z_e \in Z_H(\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1))$ such that

$$z_e \cdot q(e) = e_1, \quad \text{and} \quad z_e \cdot e_i = e_i \quad (2 \leq i \leq m_k). \tag{4.92}$$

Therefore, since elements of H and $u(L^\perp)$ commute, we have

$$z_e u(e) {z_e}^{-1} = u(e_1 + q_\perp(e)). \tag{4.93}$$

Write $q_\perp(e) = (x_{m_1+1}(e), \dots, x_{n-1}(e)) \in L^\perp \cong \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_1}$, and let

$$\omega_e := I_n + \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{n-1} x_j(e) E_{2,(1+j)} \in \mathfrak{W}. \tag{4.94}$$

Then $\omega_e u(e_1 + q_\perp(e)){\omega_e}^{-1} = u(e_1)$ and ω_e commutes with $u(e_i)$ for $i \geq 2$. Therefore by (4.90), (4.92) and (4.93),

$$\begin{aligned} V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) + V^-(\mathcal{A}_1) &\ni \omega_e z_e u(e)v = u(e_1)(\omega_e v) \\ V^0(\mathcal{A}_1) + V^-(\mathcal{A}_1) &\ni \omega_e z_e u(e_i)v = u(e_i)(\omega_e v) \quad (2 \leq i \leq m_k). \end{aligned} \tag{4.95}$$

Therefore, since $\pi_0^{\mathcal{A}}(\omega_e v) = \pi_0^{\mathcal{A}}(v) = v$ is fixed by H, by Corollary 4.7

$$H \subset \operatorname{Stab}_G(\omega_e v). \tag{4.96}$$

Now $H \cup (\omega_e H {\omega_e}^{-1}) \subset \operatorname{Stab}(v)$, $\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1) \subset H$ and $\exp(t\mathcal{A}_1)\omega_e \exp(-tA_1)$ converges to the identity element as $t \to \infty$. Therefore $\omega_e \in \operatorname{Stab}(v)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let Q be the subgroup generated by H and $\{\omega_{q_\perp(e)} = \omega_e : e \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then $Q \subset \operatorname{Stab}(v)$. By (4.91) Q is generated by H and $\omega_{L^\perp} := \{\omega_x : x \in L^\perp\}$. Now in view of (4.94) it is easily verified that subgroup generated by $Z_H(\exp(\mathcal{A}_1))$ and $\omega_{L^\perp}$ contains $\mathfrak{W}$. The group generated by $\mathfrak{W}$ and $u(L)$ contains $u(L^\perp)$. Therefore

$$\operatorname{Stab}(v) \supset Q \supset H \cdot \mathfrak{W}u(L^\perp) = Q_{m_1+1}. \tag{4.97}$$

□

We will need the following property of Q_{m_1+1}.

Lemma 4.12. *Let* $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \smallsetminus \{0\}$. *Then there is no closed proper normal subgroup of* Q_{m_1+1} *containing* $u(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Proof. Let N be a closed normal subgroup of Q_{m_1+1} containing $u(\boldsymbol{x})$. Then $u(\boldsymbol{x})$ belongs to $N \cap H$, which is a normal subgroup of H. Since $H \cong \mathrm{SL}(m_1+1,\mathbb{R})$ is a simple Lie group with finite center, it does not contain an infinite proper normal subgroup. Therefore $H \subset N$. We note that if $\omega \in \mathfrak{W} \cup u(L^\perp)$, then the closure of the group generated by $\omega \exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)\omega^{-1}$ and $\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1)$ contains ω. Since N is normal in Q_{m_1+1} and $\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_1) \subset H$, we conclude that $\mathfrak{W} \cup u(L^\perp) \subset N$. Therefore $N = Q_{m_1+1}$. ☐

5. Invariance under a unipotent flow

Our aim is to prove that the measure μ as in Corollary 3.4 is an algebraic measure. For this purpose, we will first 'stably' modify the measures μ_i, and then show that a stable modification of μ is invariant under a unipotent flow. This will allow us to use Ratner's theorem in our investigation.

5.1. **Stably twisted trajectory.** Let $q : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$ denote the projection on the span of first m_k-coordinates. We suppose that $\varphi : I = [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ satisfies the following condition for all $s \in I$,

$$q(\dot\varphi(s)) \neq 0. \tag{5.1}$$

It may be noted that since φ is an analytic curve whose image is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, φ satisfies (5.1) at all but finitely many $s \in I$.

Fix $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, and define

$$W = \{u(sw_0) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Let Z denote the centralizer of $\exp(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{A}_k)$ in $\mathrm{SL}(m_k+1,\mathbb{R})$. Then Z acts on $\mathbb{R}^{m_k}$ via the correspondence $u(z \cdot v) = zu(v)z^{-1}$ for all $z \in Z$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$. This action is transitive on $\mathbb{R}^{m_k} \smallsetminus \{0\}$. By (5.1) there exists an analytic function $z : I \to Z$ such that

$$z(s) \cdot q(\dot\varphi(s))) = w_0, \quad \forall s \in I, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\dot\varphi(s) = d\varphi(s)/ds$. In view of §4.1 and (4.3), we set

$$a_i := a_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i} = \exp(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{t}_i)), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.4}$$

Like (3.1), for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let λ_i be the probability measure on L/Λ defined by

$$\int_{L/\Lambda} f\, d\lambda_i := \frac{1}{|I|}\int_{s\in I} f(z(s)a_i u(\varphi(s))x_i)\, ds, \quad \forall f \in \mathrm{C_c}(L/\Lambda). \tag{5.5}$$

Since $\{a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} a_i^{-1} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $z(I)$ are contained in compact subsets of Z, from Theorem 3.1 we deduce that there exists a probability measure λ on L/Λ such that, after passing to a subsequence, $\lambda_i \to \lambda$ in the space of probability measures on L/Λ with respect to the weak-$*$ topology.

Theorem 5.1. *The measure λ is W-invariant.*

Proof. Let $q_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1-m_k}$ denote the projection on the last $(n-1-m_k)$-coordinates. Let $\alpha_i = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \tau'_{i,j} + \tau'_{i,m_k})$. Then for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$v = q(\xi) + q_\perp(\xi), \quad a_i \cdot q(\xi) = \alpha_i q(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i^{-1}(a_i \cdot q_\perp(\xi)) \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Take any $\epsilon > 0$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $N_i := [\epsilon|I|\alpha_i] \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\alpha_i/N_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} (\epsilon|I|)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i/N_i^2 \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0. \tag{5.7}$$

We partition $I = \cup_{r=1}^{N_i} I_r$, where $I_r = [s_r, s_{r+1}]$ and $s_{r+1} - s_r = |I|/N_i$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi_r(s) := \varphi(s_r) + (s - s_0)\dot{\varphi}(s_r), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ then} \\ &\varphi(s) = \psi_r(s) + \varepsilon_r(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_r(s) = O(N_i^{-2}), \quad \forall s \in I_r. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

By (5.6) and (5.7), $\sup_{s\in I_r} \|a_i \cdot \varepsilon_r(s)\| \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0$. Since $z(\cdot)$ is continuous and bounded, for all large i and $1 \le r \le N_i$,

$$|f(z(s)a_i u(\varphi(s))x_i) - f(z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s))x_i)| \le \epsilon, \quad \forall s \in I_r, \tag{5.9}$$

where $z_r = z(u(s_r))$, and the same holds for $f^{u(tw_0)}$ in place of f, where $f^{u(tw_0)}(x) := f(u(tw_0)x)$ for all $x \in L/\Lambda$. Therefore

$$\left| \int_{L/\Lambda} f(x)\, d\lambda_i(x) - \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} \int_{I_r} f(z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s))x_i)\, ds \right| \le \epsilon, \tag{5.10}$$

and the same for $f^{u(tw_0)}$ in place of f.

Next, for any $s \in I_r$, by (5.3) and (5.6),

$$\begin{aligned} u(tw_0)z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s)) &= z_r u(tq(\dot{\varphi}(s_r)))a_i u(\psi_r(s)) \\ &= z_r a_i u(t\alpha_i^{-1} q(\dot{\varphi}(s_r)))u(\psi_r(s)) \\ &= z_r a_i u(-t\alpha_i^{-1} q_\perp(\dot{\varphi}(s_r)))u(\psi_r(s) + t\alpha^{-1}\dot{\varphi}(s_r)) \\ &= u(z_r a_i \cdot (-t\alpha_i^{-1} q_\perp(\dot{\varphi}(s_r))))z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s + t\alpha_i^{-1})). \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

By (5.6), $\sup_{s\in I_r} \|z_r a_i \cdot (-t\alpha_i^{-1} q_\perp(\dot{\varphi}(s_r)))\| \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0$. Hence for large enough i,

$$\sum_{r=1}^{N_i} \int_{I_r} \left| f(u(tw_0)z_r a_i \psi_r(s)x_i) - f(z_r a_i \psi_r(s + t\alpha_i^{-1})x_i) \right| ds \le \epsilon|I|. \tag{5.12}$$

Now by (5.7)

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{r=1}^{N_i} \left| \int_{I_r} f(z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s))x_i)\, ds - \int_{I_r} f(z_r a_i u(\psi_r(s + t\alpha_i^{-1})x_i))\, ds \right| \\ &\le N_i(2\|f\|_\infty t\alpha_i^{-1}) \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 2t\|f\|_\infty \epsilon|I|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

For all large i, combining (5.10), (5.12) and (5.13):

$$\left| \int_{L/\Lambda} f(u(tw_0)y)\, d\lambda_i(y) - \int_{L/\Lambda} f(y)\, d\lambda_i(y) \right| \le (3 + 2t\|f\|_\infty)\epsilon. \tag{5.14}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, λ is $u(tw_0)$-invariant. $\square$

6. RATNER'S THEOREM AND DYNAMICAL BEHAVIOUR OF TRANSLATED TRAJECTORIES NEAR SINGULAR SETS

Next we will analyze the measure λ using Ratner's description of ergodic and invariant measures for unipotent flows.

For $\mathscr{H}$ be as defined in §3.1 and W be an Ad-unipotent one-parameter subgroup of G. For $H \in \mathscr{H}$, define

$$N(H,W) = \{g \in G : g^{-1}Wg \subset H\} \quad \text{and} \quad S(H,W) = \bigcup_{\substack{F\in\mathscr{H}\\ F\subsetneq H}} N(F,W). \tag{6.1}$$

Let $\pi : L \to L/\Lambda$ denote the natural quotient map. By Ratner's theorem [13], as explained in [12, Theorem 2.2]:

Theorem 6.1 (Ratner)**.** *Given a W-invariant probability measure λ on L/Λ, there exists $H \in \mathscr{H}$ such that*

$$\lambda(\pi(N(H,W)) > 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lambda(\pi(S(H,W)) = 0. \tag{6.2}$$

And almost all W-ergodic components of the restriction of λ to $\pi(N(H,W))$ are of the form $g\mu_H$, where $g \in N(H,W) \smallsetminus S(H,W)$ and μ_H is a finite H-invariant measure on $\pi(H) \cong H/H \cap \Lambda$.

In particular if H is a normal subgroup of L then λ is H-invariant. $\square$

6.1. **Algebraic criterion for zero limit measure on singular sets.** Similar to the nondivergence criterion given by Proposition 3.3, the next result provides a criterion for 'non-accumulation on singular sets' in terms of linear actions of groups; it is also referred by 'linearization technique'. Let the notation be as in §3.1. Let $w_0 \in \mathrm{Lie}(W) \smallsetminus \{0\}$. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{v \in V : v \wedge w_0 = 0\}$. Then

$$N(H,W) = \{g \in L : g \cdot p_H \in \mathscr{A}\}. \tag{6.3}$$

The following linearization statement from [18, Prop. 4.4] uses the fact that φ is analytic; cf. [14, 6, 12].

Proposition 6.2. *Let C be any compact subset of $N(H,W) \smallsetminus S(H,W)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists a compact set $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathscr{A}$ such that given any neighbourhood Φ of $\mathcal{D}$ in V, there exists a neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $\pi(C)$ in L/Λ such that for any $h_1, h_2 \in L$, and a subinterval $J \subset I$, one of the following holds:*

a) *There exists $\gamma \in \Lambda$ such that $(h_1 z(s) u(\varphi(s)) h_2 \gamma) p_H \in \Phi$, $\forall s \in J$.*
b) $|\{s \in J : \pi(h_1 z(s) u(\varphi(s)) h_2) \in \mathcal{O}\}| \leq \epsilon |J|$.

$\square$

Just as in the Proof of Theorem 3.1 we will apply this criterion to obtain an algebraic condition leading to the hypothesis of Corollary 4.9.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that there is no proper closed subgroup H of L containing $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$ such that the orbit Hx_0 is closed and admits a finite H-invariant measure. Let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be the sequence of measures as defined by (5.5). Then $\lambda_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \lambda$ in the space of probability measures on L/Λ and λ is L-invariant.*

Proof. Earlier using Theorem 3.1 we have shown that after passing to a subsequence, $\lambda_i \to \lambda$ in the space of probability measures on L/Λ, and by Theorem 5.1 λ is invariant under the Ad-unipotent one-parameter subgroup W. In order to complete the proof it is enough to show that any such limiting measure λ is L-invariant. For notational convenience we will identify any $g \in G$ with $\rho(g) \in L$.

By Theorem 6.1 there exists $H \in \mathscr{H}$ such that

$$\lambda(\pi(N(H,W)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(\pi(S(H,W)) = 0. \tag{6.4}$$

Let C be a compact subset of $N(H,W) \smallsetminus S(H,W)$ such that $\lambda(C) > \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $g_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} g_0$ be as sequence in G such that $x_0 = \pi(g_0)$ and $x_i = \pi(g_i)$ for all i. Then given any neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $\pi(C)$ in L/Λ, there exists $i_0 > 0$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$, we have $\lambda_i(\mathcal{O}) > \epsilon$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{|I|}|\{s \in I : z(s)a_i u(\varphi(s))x_i = \pi(a_i z(s)u(\varphi(s))g_i) \in \mathcal{O}\}| > \epsilon. \tag{6.5}$$

Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathscr{A}$ be as in the statement of Proposition 6.2. Choose any compact neighbourhood Φ of $\mathcal{D}$ in V. Then there exists a neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $\pi(C)$ in L/Λ such that one of the statements (a) or (b) of Proposition 6.2 holds for $J = I$, and any $h_1 = a_i$ and $h_2 = g_i$. For any $i > i_0$, (a) cannot hold due to (6.5), and hence (b) must hold; that is, there exists $\gamma_i \in \Lambda$ such that

$$(z(s)a_i u(\varphi(s))g_i\gamma_i)p_H = (a_i z(s)u(\varphi(s))g_i\gamma_i)p_H \in \Phi, \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{6.6}$$

Let $\Phi_1 = \{z(s)^{-1} : s \in I\}\Phi$. Then Φ_1 is contained in a compact subset of V, and the following holds:

$$a_i u(\varphi(s))(g_i\gamma_i)p_H \in \Phi_1, \quad \forall s \in I,\ \forall i > i_0. \tag{6.7}$$

Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on V. First suppose that after passing to a subsequence,

$$r_i := \|\gamma_i p_H\| \to \infty \quad \text{as } i \to \infty. \tag{6.8}$$

Then $v_i := \gamma_i p_H / r_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} v$ for some $v \in V$, $\|v\| = 1$. Let $R = \sup\{\|w\| : w \in \Phi_1\}$. Then by (6.7)

$$a_i u(\varphi(s))g_i v_i \leq R/r_i, \quad \forall s \in I,\ \forall i > i_0. \tag{6.9}$$

Since $R/r_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} 0$, and $g_i v_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} g_0 v$, we conclude that

$$u(\varphi(s))g_0 v_0 \subset V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{6.10}$$

Since there exists a finite set $F \subset I$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \{\varphi(s) : s \in F\}$ is an affine basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, (6.10) satisfies the condition (4.64) of Corollary 4.9 but contradicts its conclusion (4.65). Thus (6.8) fails to hold after passing to a subsequence. Therefore the set $\{\gamma_i p_H : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded. It is discrete by Proposition 3.2. Hence it is a finite set. Therefore by passing to a subsequence there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that

$$\gamma_i p_H = \gamma p_H, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6.11}$$

Therefore by (6.7) we get

$$a_i u(\varphi(s))g_i(\gamma p_H) \subset \Phi_1, \quad \forall s \in I,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6.12}$$

Let $\pi_+^{\mathcal{T}} : V \to V^+(\mathcal{T})$ be the projection parallel to $V^0(\mathcal{T}) + V^-(\mathcal{T})$. First suppose that $\pi_+^{\mathcal{T}}(u(\varphi(s))g_0\gamma p_H \neq 0$ for some $s_0 \in I$. Then there exists $c > 0$ and $i_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\pi_+^{\mathcal{T}}(u(\varphi(s_0))g_i\gamma p_H)\| \geq c$ for all $i \geq i_1$. But then $\|a_i u(\varphi(s_0)g_i\gamma p_H)\| \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \infty$, which contradicts (6.12). Therefore

$$u(\varphi(s))(g_0\gamma p_H) \subset V^0(\mathcal{T}) \oplus V^-(\mathcal{T}), \quad \forall s \in I. \tag{6.13}$$

Therefore by Proposition 4.11, Q_{m_1+1} stabilizes $g_0\gamma p_H$. By (3.2),

$$g_0^{-1}Q_{m_1+1}g_0 \subset \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}^1(H) = \mathrm{Stab}_L(\gamma p_H). \tag{6.14}$$

Since Λp_H is discrete, $\Lambda\,\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}^1(H)$ is a closed subset of L. Hence $\pi(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}^1(H))$ is closed in L/Λ. By [16, Thm. 2.3] there exists a closed subgroup H_1 of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}^1(H)$ containing all Ad-unipotent one-parameter subgroups of L contained in $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}^1(H)$ such that $H_1 \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in H_1 and $\pi(H_1)$ is closed. Since Q_{m_1+1} is generated by unipotent one-parameter subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$, by (6.14), $g_0^{-1}Q_{m_1+1}g_0 \subset H_1$. Thus $Q_{m_1+1} \subset g_0H_1g_0^{-1}$ and $(g_0H_1g_0^{-1})x_0 = g_0\pi(H_1)$ is closed and admits a finite $g_0Hg_0^{-1}$-invariant measure. Hence by the hypothesis of the theorem, $g_0H_1g_0^{-1} = L$. Therefore H is a normal subgroup of L. Therefore by Theorem 6.1, λ is H-invariant.

By (6.4) there exists $g \in \pi(N(H,W)) \neq \emptyset$. Then $W \subset gHg^{-1} = H$. Thus $W \subset Q_{m_1+1} \cap H$, which is a normal subgroup of $Q_{m_1+1} \cap H$. Hence by Lemma 4.12 we have $Q_{m_1+1} \subset H$. Since $Hx_0 = \pi(Hg_0) = g_0\pi(H)$ is closed and admits a finite H-invariant measure, by our hypothesis $H = L$. Therefore λ is L-invariant. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let the notation be as in §4.1. Then

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_0 := (\tau(1), \ldots, \tau(n-1)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \quad \text{as } i \to \infty.$$

Therefore $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}a_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_i}^{-1} \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_0}$. Hence in G/Q_{m_1+1},

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}Q_{m_1+1} \xrightarrow{i\to\infty} a_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_0}Q_{m_1+1} = a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_0}Q_{m_1+1}. \tag{6.15}$$

Therefore to prove (1.6), it is enough to prove the theorem in the case of $\tau_i = \bar{\tau}_i$.

We put $x_i = x_0$ for all i. As noted before there exists a smallest closed subgroup H of L containing $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$ such that the orbit Hx_0 is closed and admits a finite H-invariant measure. Therefore without loss of generality we may replace L by H. Now to complete the proof of the theorem, we only need to prove that μ is L-invariant.

Since φ is analytic, the condition (5.3) fails to hold only for finitely many points, and it is straightforward to reduce the proof of the theorem to the case where (5.3) holds for all $s \in I$. Now the difference between μ_i and λ_i is only through $\{z(s) : s \in I\}$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $J = [s_1, s_2] \subset I$ and $0 < s_2 - s_1 < \delta$ then $|f(z(s_1)^{-1}z(s)x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $s \in J$ and $x \in L/\Lambda$. We define λ_i^J by putting J in place of I in (5.5), similarly we define μ_i^J. Then by Theorem 6.3, $\lambda_i^J \to \lambda_L$, where λ_L is the unique L-invariant probability measure on L/Λ. Since $a_iz(s) = z(s)a_i$, we deduce that

$$\left|\int f\,d\mu_i^J - \int f(z(s_1)^{-1}x)\,d\lambda_L(x)\right| \leq \epsilon, \tag{6.16}$$

for all large i. Since λ_L is $z(s_1)$-invariant, the second integral is same as $\int f\, d\lambda_L$. Now partitioning I into finitely many J's with $|J| \leq \delta$, we deduce

$$\left| \int f\, d\mu_i - \int f\, d\lambda_L \right| \leq \epsilon, \tag{6.17}$$

for all large i. Thus $\mu_i \overset{i\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda_L$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The above proof applies to this case also. Here we are given that $x_i \to x_0$ is a convergent sequence and there is no proper closed subgroup H of G containing $\rho(Q_{m_1+1})$ such that Hx_0 is closed and admits a finite H-invariant measure. Therefore there is no need to replace H by L as in the above proof. □

The proof of Theorem 1.9 can be obtained by combining the ideas of the proof of Theorem 6.3, Proposition 4.2 and the general strategy of the proof of [6, Theorem 3].

References

[1] R. C. Baker. Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 83(1):37–59, 1978.

[2] Y. Bugeaud. Approximation by algebraic integers and Hausdorff dimension. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 65(3):547–559, 2002.

[3] J. W. S. Cassels. *An introduction to the geometry of numbers.* Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 99. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971. viii+344 pp.

[4] S. G. Dani. Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 359:55–89, 1985.

[5] S. G. Dani and G. A. Margulis. Asymptotic behaviour of trajectories of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 101(1):1–17, 1991.

[6] S. G. Dani and G. A. Margulis. Limit distributions of orbits of unipotent flows and values of quadratic forms. In *I. M. Gelfand Seminar*, pages 91–137. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993.

[7] H. Davenport and W. M.Schmidt Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. II. *Acta Arith.*, 16:413–424, 1969/1970.

[8] H. Davenport and W. M. Schmidt. Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. *Symposia Mathematica*, Vol. IV (INDAM, Rome, 1968/69), pp. 113–132, Academic Press, London, 1970.

[9] M. M. Dodson, B. P. Rynne, J. A. Vickers. Dirichlet's theorem and Diophantine approximation on manifolds. *J. Number Theory*, 36(1):85–88, 1990.

[10] D. Y. Kleinbock and G. A. Margulis. Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 148(1):339–360, 1998.

[11] Dmitry Kleinbock and Barak Weiss. Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation and homogeneous flows. *Journal of Modern Dynamics (JMD)*, 2(1):43–62, 2008.

[12] Shahar Mozes and Nimish A. Shah. On the space of ergodic invariant measures of unipotent flows. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 15(1):149–159, 1995.

[13] Marina Ratner. On Raghunathan's measure conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 134(3):545–607, 1991.

[14] Marina Ratner. Raghunathan's topological conjecture and distributions of unipotent flows. *Duke Math. J.*, 63(1):235–280, 1991.

[15] Wolfgang M. Schmidt. *Diophantine approximation.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 785. Springer, Berlin, 1980. x+299 pp.

[16] Nimish A. Shah. Uniformly distributed orbits of certain flows on homogeneous spaces. *Math. Ann.*, 289(2):315–334, 1991.

[17] Nimish A. Shah. Limit distributions of expanding translates of certain orbits on homogeneous spaces. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)*, 106:105–125, 1996.
[18] Nimish A. Shah. Limiting distributions of curves under geodesic flow on hyperbolic manifold. 25 pages. arXiv:0708.4093v1
[19] Nimish A. Shah. Equidistribution of expanding translates of curves and Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation. 26 pages. arXiv:0802.3278v1

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai 400005, INDIA
E-mail address: `nimish@math.tifr.res.in`